

CITY OF OAKLAND

BUDGET ADVISORY COMMISSION

Notice is hereby given that a **special meeting** of the City of Oakland Budget Advisory Commission (BAC) is scheduled for **Wednesday, September 25, 2019** at **6:00 pm** in **Hearing Room 4, City Hall, 2nd Floor**, at 1 Frank Ogawa Plaza.

Commission Members:

Lori Andrus, Jay Ashford, Ken Benson, Ed Gerber, Travis George, Geoffrey Johnson, Sarah Lee, Vincent Leung, Kasheica Mckinney, Caitlin Prendiville, Darin Ranahan, Brenda Roberts, Marchon Tatmon, Adam Van de Water, & Danny Wan

City's Representative(s):


Brad Johnson & Nicole Remiker – *Finance Department*

Meeting Agenda:

1. Administrative Matters
 - i. Welcome & Attendance
2. Adoption of the BAC October 2019 Report regarding the FY 2019-21 Budget Process. See attached materials [55 minutes]
 - i. Proposed Report on the City of Oakland's Biennial 2019-21 Budget Cycle
 - ii. Procedure Ad-hoc Committee Draft Documents
3. October BAC Meeting Dates [15 minutes]
4. Open Forum
5. Adjournment

City of Oakland
Budget Advisory Commission

**Report on the City of Oakland's
Biennial 2019-21 Budget Cycle**



September 25, 2019

Pursuant to the Consolidated Fiscal Policy (“CFP”) (13487 C.M.S.), the Budget Advisory Commission (“BAC” or “Commission”) submits this Report on the City of Oakland’s Biennial 2017-19 Budget Cycle. The Report was approved by the BAC at a meeting held on September 25, 2019.

Executive Summary

This report contains the BAC’s comments and recommendations related to the 2019 budget process and to the policies that guide the development and adoption of the biennial budget.

Immediately below is a summary of our recommendations, some of which are new, and some of which are carried forward from the BAC’s September 2017 and May 2019 reports to the Mayor and Council. A more detailed discussion of each recommendation follows this summary.

1. Adopt a 10-year formula to provide full funding of the Vital Services Stabilization Fund.
2. Provides a new and adequate funding source for the Landscape and Lighting District.
3. Continue to explore the revenue side of the budget, as recommended in our prior reports.
4. Provide transparent, clear, and understandable information about the City's debts and obligations.
5. Provide full funding for the obligations accruing for Other Post-Employee Benefits.
6. The City Administrator’s Office should include the BAC in the Five-Year Forecast process to promote feedback and input.
7. Adopt a Policy Directive to create transparency and reporting of departmental spending for overtime, additional to requirements in the recently-amended CFP.
8. Adopt a budget schedule which prioritizes early decision making and avoids excessive compression in the last 30 days (see charts, below).
9. Work to improve Council-Staff working relationships.
10. Expand the Budget Ambassador Program as a means of providing more budget information to Oaklanders.
11. Continue to improve Community Budget engagement as detailed on pp 2-4 of the BAC report of May 30, 2019 with specific reference to meeting ground rules, elected officials as policy-makers and, accommodations for non-English speaking and hearing-impaired residents,.
12. Continue to strengthen the centralized budget page on the City website and develop other electronic methods to communicate budget information such as Facebook, Nextdoor, etc.

A detailed explanation of the BAC's Comments and Recommendations follows.

1. The City Administrator's Office should include the BAC in the Five-Year Forecast process to promote feedback and input.

The Five-Year Forecast ("Forecast") is a critical work product, conducted primarily by City staff. It is updated regularly and is the basis for developing the City's Budget every 2 years. The City Administrator's Office should present the Forecast to the BAC each year, to inform the Commission of key and important factors and trends that could affect the financial health of the City, and to obtain feedback in the BAC's advisory capacity for continuous improvement of the forecast process.

We recommend the City Administrator provide the BAC with an annual update presentation on the Five-Year Forecast at a BAC meeting, once the primary work of the Forecast is complete. The intent is to inform this advisory body of key outputs of the Forecast and to engage the Commissioners, a group of professionals with experience in finance, operations and technology, in the continuous work of the Forecast. Further, as an advisory board, and as a means of ongoing improvement to our city government, the BAC provides regular input and oversight of the budgeting process. Since the Forecast represents the foundation for developing the City's budget, BAC's oversight should be extended to the Forecast process as well.

2. More time should be spent exploring the revenue side of the budget and in recognizing that the budget is both a revenue and expenditure program.

BAC has in the past recommended that more time be spent on reviewing the revenue side of the budget. In our prior reports, we have recommended seeking greater public engagement in revenue analysis and even-year in-depth examination of various revenue scenarios. These recommendations have included analyzing the equity impact of revenue-generating measures and measures under consideration (to assess communities within Oakland benefitting from these sources), analyzing novel revenue generation methods employed by other Charter cities, sponsoring public forums on various revenue sources, sharing independent analyses of revenue projections with the public, benchmarking Oakland's revenue performance to other jurisdictions and considering a split role real estate transfer tax, among others. *See BAC Report September 29, 2017.*

For example, with respect to an equity analysis, the BAC notes that the City relies on a variety of revenue streams that range from progressive (graduated real estate transfer tax) to regressive (sales tax). To ensure that revenues are raised in an equitable manner, the BAC recommends that the budget analyze the demographics of who is actually paying the taxes and fees that fund City services. For example, the City could look at the demographics

of who pays property tax, and how much they pay (e.g., x% is from commercial properties, y% is from residential properties, of the amount from residential properties, z% is from census tracts where the average household income was below \$50,000). Oakland should aim to have revenue streams that align with its values, and the first step in making that a possibility is to have the data to see where the money comes from.

In addition, given the City's recent focus on tackling unfunded liabilities, the BAC recommends that the City explore additional revenue sources for unfunded OPEB and pension costs. The BAC notes that pension override tax revenues ("POTR"), which have been in place since 1976, are set to expire in 2026. Expiration of the POTR may offer an opportunity to institute a replacement revenue stream for addressing unfunded liabilities without increasing current tax burden.

The City Council should instruct the City Administrator and Finance Director to consider retaining a consultant to assist both the Finance Staff and the Council in identifying alternative revenues and approaches as well as reviewing revenue practices from other California Charter and League Cities.

In addition to the CFP-required Public Opinion survey/poll on budget priorities, the City and Finance Staff should consider additional polling for acceptance of, and reactions to, alternatives for revenue generation. Now that impact fees, and other development-related sources are a part of the City's revenue repertoire, a review of effectiveness and options could augment the exploration of alternative revenue approaches.

The BAC further recommends that Finance Staff regularly seek advice and counsel on revenue and revenue approaches from the BAC and that it make regular and timely reporting on its efforts once a consultant is retained, as well as during and after the recommended polling on acceptance of various revenue approaches.

This past two-year budget cycle had its curious revenue 'squabbling' and consideration of whether the City and Finance Staff is too conservative in its revenue forecasting and projections. In the mid-cycle, perhaps Staff and Council can work on an acceptable cadence and projection policy approach to avoid future 'squabbles' and to arrive in a more timely and early enough agreement on both 3rd Quarter Revenues and also in the longer-term revenue projections and estimates. And, though this Revenue focus of the BAC is a reiteration of prior recommendations, it may also be relevant to staff, the Mayor, and to the Council that some consideration and or process be construed that allows for revenue downturns and/or projections of possible recessionary impacts, unlike the current practice.

3. Provide transparent, clear, and understandable information about the City's

debts and obligations. This information should be presented in a way that the public will understand - for example, in the form of pie charts, graphs, and summary tables.

The BAC commends the City for including an informative “Long-Term Liabilities” section starting on page E-127 of the Budget Presentation. The BAC also recommends that future Budget Presentations include the following disclosures:

Additional Attachments or References. The BAC recommends that the Budget Presentation include, either directly, via hyperlink, or by other reference, the Finance Department’s most recent informational memoranda to the City Council - including any third-party actuarial analyses or attachments - regarding the City’s unfunded liabilities, which include its California Public Employees’ Retirement System (“CalPERS”), Other Post-Employment Benefits (“OPEB”), and Police and Fire Retirement System (“PFRS”) obligations.

Currently, these memoranda are indexed online as part of City Council meeting minutes. They are difficult for the general public to find unless they know the specific meeting dates and agenda items involved. If attaching such memoranda and analyses adds too many pages to the Budget Presentation, then the BAC suggests that the City provide a robust web portal for the Budget that includes clearly listed and organized hyperlinks to these documents.

CalPERS. Although the Budget Presentation discloses the City’s expected contributions to CalPERS in the new budget cycle, the BAC also recommends that the Budget Presentation state that the City has little to no control over what it pays to CalPERS. In particular, future assessments depend on CalPERS’s financial performance and on its use of discount rates, which is a subjective method of converting future expenses into today’s dollars. Therefore, the true extent of future CalPERS payments is difficult to predict.

Incorporating valuations, analyses, or presentations from CalPERS or third parties into the Budget Presentation, either directly, by hyperlink, or by reference, would provide the public with clearer disclosure of the extent of the City’s unfunded CalPERS liability and the uncertainty of the City’s future CalPERS obligations.

OPEB. The BAC commends the Council and Mayor for implementing an OPEB policy in the new budget cycle. The BAC also recommends that the Budget Presentation disclose the difference between the City’s contributions to OPEB under its new policy and its actuarially determined contributions. The latter are the payments the City truly needs to make in order to make concrete progress towards fully funding its OPEB liabilities.

As mentioned previously, attaching the most recent Finance Department memoranda and third-party valuation regarding OPEB, either directly or by reference, would be informative to members of the public.

PFRS/POTR. Although the PFRS has an unfunded balance, the BAC recommends that the Budget Presentation more clearly state, on page E-128 and elsewhere, that the PFRS has a dedicated source of revenue in the form of pension override tax revenues (“POTR”). These POTR are expected to resolve the City’s unfunded PFRS balance by 2026, without any incremental impact on the GPF.

The BAC also recommends that the Budget Presentation state the uses of any excess POTR beyond what is required for PFRS debt service.

Debt Service. The BAC also recommends that the Budget Presentation provide a summary listing of the City’s outstanding debt. While many debt issuances appear in the Budget Presentation under “Budget Terminology” beginning on page J-1 or as part of “Fund Sources and Descriptions” beginning on page E-37, a summary table that lists all debt issuances would be informative to members of the public.

The BAC notes that many tables and disclosures can be repurposed from the City’s Comprehensive Annual Financial Report so as to minimize the extra work required of City staff in preparing the Budget Presentation.

Deferred Maintenance and Other Capital Needs. On page 10, the Budget Presentation notes that “deferred maintenance and other unfunded capital needs” combine “for a total of more than \$2 billion in the next five years.” The BAC recommends that the City revisit this figure and the Budget Presentation provides a summary table estimating the City’s deferred maintenance and capital needs, the extent to which such needs are funded, and the sources of such funds.

The BAC notes that relevant sections of the Capital Improvement Program could be repurposed as part of this disclosure.

In accordance with the CFP, the BAC recommends that the Budget Presentation clearly state whether or not there are any unallocated GPF balances in the current or previous budget cycle, and how such balances are being used.

Any performance management program should include sufficient staff for implementation, and personnel vacancy rates should be considered as part of such a program.

The BAC first made this recommendation in its May 30, 2019 report to the Mayor and Council. The BAC recommends that Council adopts Policy Directives to ensure this program

will be successfully implemented.

4. Adopt a Policy Directive to create transparency and reporting of departmental spending for overtime, additional to requirements in the recently-amended CFP.

The BAC recommends consistent enforcement of departmental requirements addressing overtime expenditures. The CFP currently requires that departments projected to overspend in the GPF by more than 1% develop a corrective action plan to bring their budget into balance in order to improve expenditure controls for personnel and non-personnel costs, including overtime. Additionally, the BAC recommends the corrective action plan include a detailed analysis of the top drivers of the overtime expenditure, justification for the deviation, and a list of the top ten employees receiving overtime during that period.

Funding of Vital Services Stabilization Fund


The Council, in the CFP, has established a Vital Services Stabilization fund with a target funding of 15% of the General Purpose Fund revenues. The purpose of the VSSF is to protect Oakland against service cuts and layoffs when the inevitable economic downturn occurs. The VSSF is funded from excess Real Estate Transfer Tax revenues or other one-time revenues. Using the current budget as a standard, the VSSF could have a balance of \$102 million, yet it only contains \$14,423,168. We are 14% funded. This means that, when an economic downturn occurs, there will be very limited protection against service cuts and layoffs. The current budget added \$100,440 to the VSSF.

We recommend that the Council make funding of the VSSF a higher priority by adjusting the formula for allocation of RETT funds to insure a minimum deposit of \$10 million per budget cycle or adopt a formula which will accomplish full funding of the VSSF over 5-10 years.

5. Follow a Reasonable Timeline.

Adoption of the FY 2019-21 was characterized by SPUR as a “rancorous two-month long process.” We believe much of the conflict was the result of compressing the significant decision making into the last 30 days rather than the more measured process seen in prior budget deliberations. Following are charts which compare and illustrate this difference:

Comparison of Staff Input/Response Between FY2017-19 and FY2019-21 Budget Cycles



Source: BAC Analysis

Comparison of Staff Responses Between FY2017-19 and FY2019-21 Budget Cycles

	Number of City Council Questions Addressed by Staff		Number of Pages of Staff Response Document	
	FY 2017-19	FY 2019-21	FY 2017-19	FY 2019-21
Staff Response #1	33	17	17	7
Staff Response #2	43	40	23	19
Staff Response #3	48	7	21	6
Staff Response #4	1	38	1	12
Staff Response #5	10	33	6	15
Staff Response #6	N/A	10	N/A	5
Supplemental Revenue Report	N/A	0	N/A	13
Staff Response #7	N/A	4	N/A	34
TOTAL:	135	149	68	111

Source: BAC Analysis

In order to avoid this in future budget deliberations we recommend the following:

1. Hold a full day Council Budget Retreat no later than February 1 and use that Council retreat to define Council Priorities.
2. Devote significant Council time to reviewing the Five-Year Forecast when it is released in mid-March. A major focus should be upon reviewing revenues and financial uncertainties.
3. Encouraging early Council member submission of questions for staff review and response.
4. Receive a detailed report on 3rd Quarter revenues and expenditures in early May and adopt official revenue estimates no later than May 30th.

The 2019-21 Budget deliberations were very different from past budget deliberations due to the introduction of a Council President’s Proposed Budget, which proposed very significant changes to the Mayor’s Proposed Budget. The result was to introduce a much more robust discussion of many aspects of the budget. Since this was the first time that such a discussion occurred, we do not know if this will be a continuing practice. However, if it is then we believe the budget calendar may need to be significantly revised. Such revision must ensure that the Council, Staff, Consultants, and, most importantly, the Public can meaningfully participate. We recommend that Staff review the overall sequencing/timing of events and provide a report to the Council for consideration within the next 6 Months.

6. Good Council/Staff Working Relationship Necessary

We believe a professional relationship between the Council and Staff is essential to development and adoption of the Budget. We have noted several occasions in which budget participants have engaged in public criticism of one another. This is undesirable in that it: (1) undermines staff morale, (2) interferes with a sound working relationship between and Council and Staff, and (3) undermines public trust in the budget process overall.

We strongly recommend that means be developed to resolve such conflicts in a constructive manner and, as appropriate, in Executive Session.

7. Expand Budget Ambassador Program

The BAC commends the introduction of the Budget Ambassador Program this year, wherein the Mayor's office recruited and trained residents to conduct their own budget informational sessions (e.g. house parties) for fellow residents. The BAC recommends continuing and expanding this program by providing similar budget tools to Council Members, other City officials and employees.

Budget Advisory Commission Review of Budget Process and the Mayor’s Proposed Policy Budget for FY 2019-2021

The Budget Advisory Committee (“BAC”) provides this review of the budget process and of the Mayor’s Proposed Policy Budget (“MPPB”) for Fiscal Years 2019-2021.

A summary of the BAC’s observations and primary recommendations is set forth in the Executive Summary. These observations and recommendations are explained in greater detail in Parts II and III of this report.

I. Executive Summary.

Overall, the BAC commends the continued outreach efforts by the Mayor’s office and Councilmembers to promote budget literacy, and encouraging public participation in the budgeting process. In Part II we make several recommendations for improving the process. We particularly recommend formalizing the Budget Ambassador (or similar) program and expanding budget literacy efforts throughout the year.

With respect to the MPPB, we highlight the following five recommendations in Part III:

Still? **A. One-Time Funds.** The BAC notes that the MPPB backslides from the 2017-19 budget in its use of one-time revenues to fund ongoing expenditures, and recommends that the final budget explore ways to reduce or eliminate reliance on such revenues for ongoing expenditures, focusing one-time revenues on paying down unfunded liabilities.

CARRYFORWARD **B. Landscaping and Lighting Assessment District (LLAD).** The BAC recommends the City pursue options for an appropriate revenue replacement for LLAD to resolve the problem described in the MPPB.

CARRYFORWARD **C. Revenues.** The BAC reiterates its recommendation that more time be spent exploring the revenue side of the budget. Recognizing that the budget is both a revenue and expenditure program we have in the past recommended that significantly more time be spent on reviewing the revenue side of the budget. In our prior reports we have recommended seeking greater public engagement in revenue analysis and even year in-depth examination of various revenue scenarios.

CARRYFORWARD **D. Other Post-Employment Benefits (“OPEB”).** The BAC commends the City for establishing and following its OPEB policy. However, it recommends that the budget document analyze the difference between the City’s contributions under the OPEB policy and its actuarially determined OPEB contributions to

maintain public awareness of the need for continued public action on this subject.

CARRFORWARD

- E. Consultation with City Commissions and Disclosure of Divergence.** The BAC recommends that, where a city commission has within its charge to make recommendations on City spending, the Mayor's Office and administration work collaboratively with the commission far in advance of the budget cycle to minimize the risk of diverging priorities. If the budget does not adopt recommendations, it should so state.
-

II. The Budget Process.

The BAC is providing feedback on the Mayor's proposed budget and on the community outreach process undertaken during this budget cycle. To that end, we have attended the Mayoral and Councilmember forums that took place around Oakland during the months of April and May 2019. Our commentary and recommendations are below.

CARRFORWARD ALL
OF SECTIONS A-G

A. Improved and Expanded Community Engagement.

This budget cycle is the third consecutive cycle in which budget forums to solicit community input on budget priorities took place in all seven council districts in addition to the 4-5 budget workshops held by the Mayor around the city. The BAC commends the Mayor and Councilmembers for continuing to hold these forums geographically across the city and making them available to a broader group of Oakland residents. Other positive aspects that the BAC noted from our attendance at a majority of the Councilmember sessions include:

- Having the Councilmember present at the meetings;
- Having highly knowledgeable Budget Bureau staff ~~eo~~-present and answering questions from the audience;
- Having an informative and illustrative PowerPoint to visualize and reinforce the topics being discussed; and
- Having at least one mechanism at the meetings to capture community feedback, an open mic for attendees to voice their questions and concerns, passing out index cards to capture questions from the audience, or having a large piece of paper on the wall to capture ideas and concerns raised by audience attendees.

B. Establish Clear Ground Rules at the Beginning of Each Meetings.

The BAC recommends that Councilmembers, as part of their opening comments at the forum, establish clear ground rules for asking questions, when those questions can be asked, and how long each audience member should limit themselves to when asking a question. For example, imposing a one-minute limit to questions would greatly facilitate the ability of all persons to be heard. Ideally, a trained neutral facilitator could assume this role, better ensuring that all community voices are heard, both by Councilmembers, staff, and other residents. The BAC supports the use of question cards, as being particularly effective as a means of categorizing questions, where applicable.

C. Establish Elected Officials' Roles as Policy-Makers.

The BAC noted at some forums the Councilmembers clearly articulated their role as policy-makers, responsible for setting priorities and making the budget allocation decisions. Making this distinction at the beginning of each forum can help residents direct any policy and priority-related questions to elected officials, whereas budget bureau staff may be better positioned to answer any definitional or procedural budget questions posed by residents.

D. Better Accommodations for Non-English Speaking and Hearing-Impaired Residents.

In the spirit of continuing to expand and improve outreach to the community, the BAC recommends ensuring that budget overview literature in Spanish, Chinese, (and possibly other commonly spoken languages as well) be made readily available at all forums. Additionally, the BAC supports the availability (where applicable and practical) of real-time translation in other common languages, enabled by the use of headsets so that non-English speaking residents can could follow the presentation in real time. The BAC recommends providing sign-language translation for hearing-impaired residents. Better and more consistent prior notice of the availability of translation services at the forums should be provided.

E. Help Residents Understand Budgeting Basics.

The BAC recommends that future presentations help explain in more detail some core concepts around budgeting (e.g. GPF vs. restricted funds, negative fund balances, unfunded actuarial liabilities, etc.) that might help audience members better understand how decisions are made and what tradeoffs need to be evaluated. Added explanations of these subjects should be developed in the budget and budget handouts. This could be accomplished with enhanced use of visual aids, promoting the Mayor's online videos, use of key terms in the budget's glossary, and frequently asked questions (FAQ) sheet. In addition,

the BAC recommends conducting budget overview sessions with the public during the off-year (i.e. mid-cycle years) to help citizens better understand basic budget concepts, policies and practices.

F. Budget Ambassador Program.

The BAC commends the introduction of the Budget Ambassador Program this year, wherein the Mayor's office recruited and trained residents to conduct their own budget informational sessions (e.g. house parties) for fellow residents. The BAC recommends continuing and expanding this program, where practical.

G. Continue to Publicize and Promote Budget Information and Documentation.

The BAC encourages continued use of a centralized budget page on the City's website (i.e. www.oaklandca.gov/budget), as an easy-to-remember online location for residents and taxpayers for information about the budget, about Councilmember priorities, and about the overall budgeting process. Additionally, we recommend enhanced use of popular social media platforms (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, etc.) by the Mayor's office and Councilmembers to further promote and share this budget information with residents.

III. The Mayor's Proposed Policy Budget.

DID ADOPTED BUDGET HAVE THIS PROBLEM??

A. One-Time Funds.

The BAC notes that the MPPB backslides from the 2017-19 budget in its use of one-time revenues to fund ongoing expenditures and recommends that the final budget explore ways to reduce or eliminate reliance on such revenues for ongoing expenditures, focusing one-time revenues on paying down unfunded liabilities.

In our September 2017 report, we recommended that future documents summarizing the adopted budget include an exhibit that clearly itemizes one-time sources and uses. *See* BAC's Report on the City of Oakland's Biennial 2017-19 Budget Cycle 4-5 (Sept. 2017).

This year's MPPB purports to "limit[] the use of one-time resources for ongoing expenditures" May 1, 2019 Transmission Letter at 11. However, it includes substantial reliance on one-time funding for ongoing expenditures. *See* MPPB at E-131-32; *see, e.g., id.* at B-2 ("[a]ppropriate one-time funding of \$100,000 in FY 2019-20 for Phase I of the Healthy Home Rental Inspection Program"); *id.* ("[a]ppropriate \$480,000 in one-time funding (\$240,000 per each fiscal year) for Last Saturday Free Dump Days"); *id.* at B-3 ("[s]ustains funding for emergency medical supplies using one-time funds in Measure N"); *id.* at E-8, E-11, E-13-14, G-58, G-61, G-70, G-76. This use of one-time funding for ongoing expenditures appears to outstrip the use of one-time funding for ongoing expenditures in

the FY 2017-19 budget. See S. Landreth Transmission Letter, FY 2017-19 Adopted Policy Budget 1 (Oct. 2017).

The Consolidated Financial Policy (“CFP”) notes that one-time revenues shall be used for one-time expenditures, debt retirement, or unfunded long-term obligations such as negative fund balances and PFRS/CalPERS/OPEB liabilities. It also recommends that any remaining one-time revenues remain as available fund balances. Other uses must be authorized by City Council resolutions that explain the need for using such one-time funds in contravention of CFP, and the plan to return to using such one-time funds in accordance with CFP.

The MPPB highlights two instances where one-time revenues are used to fund ongoing services. Moreover, in the May 7, 2019 City Council meeting, City staff (“Staff”) presented two resolutions to enable these exceptions to the CFP.

In the first, \$4.0M in annual funds for ongoing parks and recreation costs comes from one-time sources. Funding for parks and recreation services normally comes, in part, from Landscape & Lighting Assessment District (“LLAD”) revenues, which have remained unchanged for over 30 years. To align with the CFP, the Budget Resolution authorizes and directs the City Administrator to pursue a ballot measure that will eliminate the use of such one-time funds in the future.

In the second, \$0.2M in annual funds for medications and supplies used by the Oakland Fire Department (“OFD”) in emergency medical services (“EMS”) comes from Measure N. OFD is usually the first responder in EMS situations in Oakland which may require the use of medications. Alameda County’s new Ambulance Contract no longer provides for County ambulances to replace medications used by local fire department paramedics in EMS situations. To align with the CFP, the Budget Resolution authorizes and directs the City Administrator to pursue revenue enhancements, negotiations with Alameda County, and additional fiscal adjustments to provide permanent and ongoing revenue for paramedic services.

While the BAC recognizes that the City cannot necessarily foresee changes in County policy that will necessitate filling in gaps, it urges the City whenever possible to avoid using one-time funds for ongoing services, lest such practice result in a worsening structural deficit.

CARRYFORWARD

B. The Landscaping and Lighting Assessment District.

The BAC recommends the City pursue options on an appropriate revenue replacement for the Landscaping and Lighting Assessment District (LLAD).

Oakland property owners pay through property taxes into Oakland’s LLAD fund. These property tax revenues support services for the more than 130 City parks, community

centers and to maintain street lights. Established more than thirty years ago, LLAD revenues have not kept up with the increased costs to service these facilities as it never had a mechanism to adjust costs and payrolls as they increased over time. The City must identify a means to amend the LLAD to maintain existing service levels.

CARRYFORWARD

C. Other Revenue Sources.

The BAC reiterates its recommendation that more time be spent exploring the revenue side of the budget.

Recognizing that the budget is both a revenue and expenditure program we have in the past recommended that significantly more time should be spent on reviewing the revenue side of the budget. In our prior reports we have recommended seeking greater public engagement in revenue analysis and even year in-depth examination of various revenue scenarios. These recommendations have included analyzing the equity impact of revenue generating measures and measures under consideration (to assess communities within Oakland benefitting from these sources), analyzing novel revenue generation methods employed by other charter cities, sponsoring public forums on various revenue sources, sharing independent analyses of revenue projections with the public, benchmarking Oakland's revenue performance to other jurisdictions, and considering a split role real estate transfer tax, among others. See BAC Report September 29, 2017.

Given the City's recent focus on tackling unfunded liabilities, the BAC recommends that the City explore additional revenue sources for unfunded OPEB and pension costs. The BAC notes that pension tax override revenues (PTOR), which have been in place since 1976, are set to expire in 2026. Expiration of the PTOR may offer an opportunity to institute a replacement revenue stream for addressing unfunded liabilities without increasing current tax burden.

CARRYFORWARD

D. Other Post-Employment Benefits.

The BAC commends the City for establishing and following its OPEB policy. However, it recommends that the budget document analyze the difference between the City's contributions under the OPEB policy and its actuarially determined OPEB contributions.

The BAC commends the City for adopting an OPEB Funding Policy to set aside 2.5% of payroll ("Additional OPEB Payments") towards its unfunded OPEB obligations in addition to its existing pay-as-you-go expenses. These additional OPEB Payments are projected to be \$10 million in each of FY2019-20 and FY2020-21.

In a report prepared for the City on January 14, 2019 by PFM Group Consulting LLC, the City's pay-as-you-go expenses are projected to be \$31.4M in FY2019-20 and \$33.6M in

FY2020-21. Meanwhile, the City’s actuarially determined OPEB contributions (“ADC”) are expected to be \$83.5M for FY2019-20 and \$87.9M for FY2020-2021. The ADC is the amount the City ought to pay to ensure sufficient funds for future benefits. It includes the City’s pay-as-you-go expense as well as an amortization payment towards its unfunded OPEB liability.

Even though the City recently negotiated benefit packages with its employees that will reduce its total unfunded OPEB liability in the long term, and even though \$10M in additional OPEB Payments in each of FY2019-20 and FY2020-21 are an improvement over previous longstanding City practices, such payments will **not** be sufficient to bridge the gap between the City’s ADC and pay-as-you-go expenses, which will be \$52.1M in FY2019-20 and \$54.3M in FY2020-21.

The BAC recommends that the City expand its OPEB discussion in the budget to note that \$10M in Additional OPEB Payments will still be insufficient to cover the City’s ADC in FY2019-20 and FY2020-21.

CARRYFORWARD

E. Consultation With City Commissions and Disclosure of Divergence.

The BAC recommends that, where a city commission has within its charge to make recommendations on City spending, the Mayor’s Office and administration work collaboratively with the commission far in advance of the budget cycle to minimize the risk of diverging priorities. Where the budget diverges from such recommendations, it should so state.

The BAC understands that the MPPB does not follow recommendations made by the Sugar Sweetened Beverage (SSB) Community Advisory Board as to expenditure of Measure HH funds. While the Board’s recommendations are advisory, deviation from them could undermine public confidence in future revenue-generating measures that rely on general taxes with accompanying advisory boards, a structure necessitated by state law. Accordingly, the BAC recommends that the Mayor’s Office and administration work collaboratively with the Board, as well as any other similar bodies with advisory authority over City spending, well in advance of the budget cycle to minimize the risk of diverging priorities on spending. If the budget diverges from such recommendations, it should so state.

CARRYFORWARD

F. Performance Management Program.

The BAC recommends that any performance management program include sufficient staff for implementation and that personnel vacancy rates be considered as part of such a program.

We note in the MPPB the proposal by CM Taylor to establish a Performance Management Program. We support this proposal which is consistent with our prior recommendations to

include “comparative analytics.” This program will place an added workload on staff. Such data should include continuing reports on personnel vacancy rates. We therefore recommend that such a program include the provision of necessary staff. We further recommend that the Council consider the workload placed upon staff by its regular actions requiring additional reports on matters it is considering and provide necessary staff to meet this workload.

CLOSED??

G. General Purpose Fund Emergency Reserves.

The BAC recommends the City Administrator confirm the General Purpose Fund Emergency Reserves were not appropriated during the year.

The City accumulated a reserve fund in accordance with the Reserve Fund Balance of 7.5% of the General Purpose Fund as of June 30, 2018. The policy requires approval of any appropriations of funds from the Emergency Reserves. Appropriations from the fund, if any, and reasons for appropriations made during the prior fiscal year, or a statement that no appropriations were made, should be included in MPPB under *Financial Summaries – Consistency with the Consolidation Fiscal Policy*.

CARRYFORWARD

H. Councilmember Priorities.

The BAC commends the inclusion of Councilmember priorities, but recommends priorities be ranked in order of importance and that revenue suggestions be included.

We are pleased to note that this MPPB includes a statement of priorities by all Council members. The CFP invites “up to seven expenditure priorities in ranked and/or weighted order” including revenue suggestions. However submissions were not always in priority order. We recommend the inclusion of priority ranking. In addition, we recommend that Council members suggest potential revenue streams to pay for listed priorities.

CARRYFORWARD??

I. Negative Fund Balances.

The BAC commends the City on its progress in addressing negative fund balances and urges the City to stay the course.

Addressing negative fund balances has long been a priority of the BAC. *See* September 2017 BAC Report at 4; May 2017 BAC Report at 2. The MPPB identifies negative fund balances in the amount of \$60 million, \$32.3 million with a repayment plan, \$27.7 million of which are reimbursement funds, and \$0.2 million of which are funds with no repayment plan. MPPB E-127. For example, the Capital Improvements Reserve Bond Fund (Fund 5510) is a negative fund which is on a repayment schedule in the amount of \$123,000 for retirement by 2028-29. These are trending downward from the FY2017-19 budget, which showed

negative funds of \$73 million, \$26.9 million with a repayment plan, \$31.8 million of which were reimbursement funds, and \$14.2 million with no repayment plan; and accrued leave of \$47.1 million. FY 2017-19 Budget E-131.

The BAC commends the City for making progress on these unfunded long-term liabilities, and refers the Council back to their Fall 2018 letter to Council for addressing negative fund balances.

EXPANDED??

J. Sick and Vacation Leave Liabilities.

The BAC recommends that the budget separate sick and vacation leave liabilities.

The MPPB identifies as a liability accrued vacation and sick leave of more than \$49 million as of June 30, 2018. MPPB E-127. Regarding accrued vacation and sick leave, the BAC recommends breaking apart these two amounts in the budget document for transparency's purpose, given the different legal status of these respective liabilities.

CARRYFORWARD **K. Inclusion of an Index.**

The BAC recommends that the budget document include an index.

Navigating the MPPB, particularly the hard copy, is difficult due to lack of an index. The BAC recommends that, to the extent feasible, Budget Bureau staff include an index to facilitate review of the budget.